The following committee appointed by the Chairman met at 11:30 a. m., March 31, 1916, at the Century Club, New York City, to consider a number of matters that had arisen and required attention:

Mr. Olmsted,
~~Mr. Hastings,~~
Mr. Gilbert,
Mr. Blashfield, and
Mr. Anderson.

The Chairman, Mr. Moore, was present exofficio, and also Colonel Harts, the Secretary, and Mr. Cammerer, the Clerk, who had been requested to attend.

MINT MATTERS:

Mr. Woolley, Director of the Mint, had been informed of this informal meeting, and dropped in shortly after it began for consultation with reference to designs prepared in the Philadelphia Mint for the obverse and reverse of a proposed McKinley souvenir gold dollar. Mr. Woolley stated that he was not much pleased with the designs, but that the motives had been prescribed for him by the association to whom the gold dollars were to be turned over at par in accordance with the law. Suggestions were made to enlarge the size of the head shown, and to reduce the size of the building shown by using only the central motive and leaving out some of the lettering. Mr. Woolley did not leave a duplicate of the designs which he passed around for inspection, as he had only the one set.

The Director further said that he had hoped to bring with him the final designs for the new subsidiary coins, but that Mr. Weinman and Mr. MacNeil, the two sculptors, had not been able to complete their models. He requested the Chairman to designate a committee to inspects these designs later on, and he was advised that this matter would be left in the hands of Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield, the same committee with whom he had conferred before.

A. B. C. MEDIATOR MEDALS:

Miss Janet Scudder had written Mr. Phillips, Assistant Secretary of State, that she had restudied her design for the obverse of the A. B. C. media tor medals, and would send it to him for approval. Mr. Phillips, learning

of the proposed meeting in New York, requested Miss Scudder to turn the model over to the committee for an opinion. The design was turned over to Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield as a committee, who later recommended approval of the general composition and arrangement of the design with the understanding that there will be a resubmission of the executed model before the dies for the medal are struck. (See Exhibit A.)

HEIGHTS OF BUILDINGS REPORT: Colonel Harts mentioned the matter of the proposed report to the District Commissioners on the question of suitable height limitations for buildings within the District of Columbia. He submitted for consideration certain points which he felt might be included in the report as drafted by the committee, stating that it was his feeling that the report was too general in form and not sufficiently explicit as to desirable limitations. These were discussed, and Mr. Olmsted and Mr. Anderson, the committee in charge of the preparation of the draft, took them into consideration in a further study of the preliminary draft which they had prepared.

LANDSCAPE TREATMENT AROUND LINCOLN MEMORIAL: Mr. Anderson had brought along a number of progressive studies Mr. Clarence Howard had sent him, leading up to a conclusion based on these studies. It was decided to request Mr. Howard to develop this final sketch in such form as to be compared with another study on different lines which Mr. Henry Bacon, the architect of the memorial, had prepared. Mr. Bacon was present during the discussion, and stated that he had sent to Washington a small-sized model showing his conclusions as to a desirable treatment of the approaches and other surroundings of the memorial.

Colonel Harts later stated that Mr. Bacon had decided upon Jules Guerin as his

choice for the painter to do the interior mural decorating of the Lincoln Memorial, and asked whether, in the opinion of the members, he would be the best man for this work. The Committee felt that the architect's choice would be a satisfactory one, and also that a sum of from $40,000 to $45,000, mentioned as available for the work, would not be at all too large for work of that character.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC: Colonel Harts informed the members that the Secretary of War had written a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approving the old Casey-Burr design for a memorial bridge across the Potomac as suitable for the proposed new location between the Lincoln Memorial, as one terminus, and Arlington, as the other, and stating that he did not deem it necessary to expend any more money for additional designs in view of the fact that a satisfactory design already was selected. The members advised that the old design was prepared at a time when the Lincoln Memorial was still an undecided matter, and that, in view of its erection in West Potomac Park, the old design would have to be restudied if it was to be in any way adopted, - in particular that the large towers appearing on the bridge in the design would have to be eliminated so that there would be no competition with the treatment of the Lincoln Memorial terminus. They felt that the proposed bridge at the new location should be of the simplest possible design and should not detract by architectural embellishment from the treatment of either terminus; and that the treatment of the approaches to the bridge from the Arlington side, which had not yet been carefully studied, needed such study. Mr. Olmsted offered to write a personal note to the Secretary of War, and asked Colonel Harts also to tell the Secretary the Commission's views as discussed. This was done. See letters on file in P.B. & G.

LIMITATION OF SIZE AND DESIGNS OF TOMBSTONES FOR ARLINGTON CEMETERY: Colonel Harts informed the members that the official authorities in charge of Arlington Cemetery had accepted all the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the treatment of Arlington Cemetery, but had asked for further advice and assistance in connection with the solving of the problem of a proper limitation in size and design of tombstones to be erected there in the future. He stated that this matter had been referred to Mr. Olmsted, who was the committee that had handled the previous reference. The matter was discussed. Mr. Olmsted's report, which was later transmitted, was approved by the members of the Commission, and copies have already been furnished separately.

BOTANIC GARDEN: Colonel Harts also called the attention of the members to the following extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Senate Committee on the Library held February 22d last:

> "A Committee consisting of Senators Cummins, Newlands, and Gallinger was appointed to confer with Colonel Harts, and to enter into correspondence with the Commission of Fine Arts for the purpose of procuring from them a plan adapting the plan of the Park Commission to the Grant monument and to the retention of the hot houses where they now are; and also for the purpose of suggesting a site in Rock Creek Park for an arboretum and an enlarged Botanic Garden, and to consider whether all of Rock Creek Park should not be considered as a grand arboretum and botanic garden, beginning at some site to be selected by the Commission and gradually carrying out the original plan, as adapted, to its ultimate consummation.".

BILLS REFERRED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY:

A number of bills introduced in the present Congress and referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library were then taken up. The action in each case was as follows:

S. 4682, to purchase an oil painting entitled "Our Glory-the Battleship Oregon". The Commission had previously reported ona similar bill for the purchase of this painting introduced in the preceding Congress, and requested Mr. Blashfield

to paraphrase that report and add a sentence to the effect that the amount of $25,000 provided for in the bill for the acquisition of the painting might be considerably reduced. The report made is attached under Exhibit B.

S. 3345, for the purchase, for $20,000, of oil portraits of twenty-five former justices of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Blashfield was requested also to draft a reply in this matter, and for that purpose to paraphrase a previous report made on the same subject, adding a sentence to the effect that the amount requested was somewhat high. See Exhibit C for report made.

S. 2263, S. 611, and S. 675, providing for the erection of monuments in Washington to the memory of General John Sullivan, Matthew Fontaine Maury, and John Ericsson, respectively. It was directed that these bills should be reported on along the lines of a report made in December, 1914, on similar bills providing for the erection of monuments to Sullivan and Maury in Washington. This was done, as is shown by Exhibit D.

S. 4269 proposed a suitable memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pa. The committee directed a report advising against the passage of the bill for the reason that, in their opinion, the sum of ten thousand dollars mentioned therein was inadequate for a suitable national monument to Lincoln, and that, as Congress is now spending a large sum of money for the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, it would appear unsuitable at this time to erect another monument to him in such close proximity to the Capital. See Exhibit E.

S. 3651 provided for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon in the courthouse square at Warrenton, N. C. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill in case Congress should decide to erect a monument to him, but they suggested inserting a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the

Commission of Fine Arts in order to protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design, and that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial". See Exhibit F.

S. 610 provided for the erection of a statue to John Marshall in the hallway of the courtroom of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Federal building at Richmond, Va. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill, but suggested that the design of the statue and the completed statue itself shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to procure the best artistic results for the United States. See Exhibit G.

S. 613 provided for the erection of a monument in Abingdon, Va., to the memory of General William Campbell. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill, but suggested a provision to the effect that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, and that the words "monument" and "statue" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial". See Exhibit H.

S. 194 provided for the erection of a memorial in the form of a shaft to Colonel Edward Dickinson Baker at Ball's Bluff, Va. The committee felt that a suitable simple form of memorial could be obtained for the sum of $5,000 given in the bill, but felt it injudicious to prescribe the form of memorial by designating a shaft; they suggested that the word "memorial" should be substituted for the word "shaft", and that the decision as to what form the memorial should take should then be left to the Executive Officer in charge of the construction of the memorial. They further suggested the insertion of a provision to the effect that the design and the completed memorial itself shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. See Exhibit I.

S. 376 provided for the erection of a suitable memorial in the city of Knoxville, Tenn. to Admiral David Glasgow Farragut. The committee suggested the insertion of a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine

Arts. See Exhibit J.

S 3589 set aside that part of the newly acquired lands between the Union Station and the Capitol lying north of C street for sites for memorials to women and their achievements. The committee questioned the expediency on artistic grounds of making such a determination in advance of any general plan for the development of the area referred to, and also felt that it would seem injudicious to restrict the type of memorials to be located there, should Congress so decide, to any particular class. Preparation of this report was turned over to Mr. Moore. See Exhibit K.

S. 2885 proposed giving the D. A. R. permission to erect statues or busts of former Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the United States in 16th street in this city. The committee felt that the size and length of 16th street is such that the statues or busts would seem lost. They advised against the bill on the ground that the memorials, if placed in that location, would commemorate these men in far less prominent positions than other Presidents who had already been commemorated. Mr. Moore was also requested to draft this reply, which is given under Exhibit L.

S. 1359, authorized the Secretary of War to erect at Valparaiso, Chile, a suitable monument to the memory of the officers and sailors who were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the English ships Phoebe and Cherub in 1814. The committee felt that, however gratifying it might be to this country and to Chile to erect such a monument, it might create unpleasant feelings in our great neighbor England, and that monuments of that character which are so peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people should be erected within the borders of our own country, - otherwise other nations might also decide to erect monuments for similar purposes without considering these delicate points of propriety. The preparation of this report was left to Mr. Moore, but as several

questions arose during his consideration of the reply which have not yet been cleared up, no report has been forwarded.

S. 452 provided for the erection of a suitable monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps in the Isthmian Canal Zone. The committee directed the secretary to paraphrase a previous report made regarding the same subject. See Exhibit M.

S. 609 proposed an appropriation of $5,000 to aid the Pocahontas Memorial Association in completing and erecting a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Virginia. The committee advised against the bill because they understood a suitable monument to Pocahontas already existed at Norfolk. It has since been ascertained that no monument to Pocahontas is located at either Norfolk or Jamestown, and that what was probably in the minds of the committee was the base for the statue for the acquisition of which the $5,000 provided in this bill was to be used. The report has been held until the next meeting.

S. 2994 proposed the purchase of a large painting of the battle of Gettysburg by James Walker for the sum of $150,000, such painting to be placed in the Lincoln Memorial in Washington. This bill was referred to Mr. Blashfield for inspection of the painting and report.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING: Colonel Harts brought up for informal discussion the matter of the proposed archives building to be erected in Washington.

Mr. Moore said that he had seen the preliminary sketch design for this building, and that he believed it to be of a type suitable for location on the Mall or elsewhere on a good location in Washington. He added that he had been assured that it would be referred to the Commission at the proper time.

Colonel Harts called attention to a report Professor Jameson of the Carnegie Institute at Washington had prepared, it was understood as the suggestion of the building commission in charge of this building, in which he discussed the suitability of various sites, which he had lettered on an accompanying chart from A to H. The

Committee felt that site A, immediately north of the Congressional Library, would probably be the most suitable but that they were opposed to closing Maryland Avenue. As the design for the proposed building will probably not fit into that area unless Maryland Avenue is closed in the same manner as Pennsylvania Avenue was closed to accommodate the Congressional Library, site A probably could not be considered. Of the other sites suggested by Professor Jameson, site lettered D appealed to them as next best; this is the area immediately east of the site already set aside for the George Washington Memorial Mall, and is located immediately between Pennsylvania Avenue and The Mall. This was only the members' informal opinion, since the matter had not come before them officially and they were without any official information on the subject.

The Committee, after some further discussion, then adjourned.

Charles Moore
Chairman.

Merrill Hughes
COLONEL, U. S. ARMY
Secretary

The following committee appointed by the Chairman met at 11:30 a. m., March 31, 1916, at the Century Club, New York City, to consider a number of matters that had arisen and required attention.

Mr. Olmsted,
Mr. Hastings,
Mr. Gilbert,
Mr. Blashfield, and
Mr. Anderson.

The Chairman, Mr. Moore, was present exofficio, and also Colonel Harts, the Secretary, and Mr. Cammerer, the Clerk, who had been requested to attend.

MINT MATTERS: Mr. Woolley, Director of the Mint, had been informed of this informal meeting, and dropped in shortly after it began for consultation with reference to designs prepared in the Philadelphia Mint for the obverse and reverse of a proposed McKinley souvenir gold dollar. Mr. Woolley stated that he was not much pleased with the designs, but that the motives had been prescribed for him by the association to whom the gold dollars were to be turned over at par in accordance with the law. Suggestions were made to enlarge the size of the head shown, and to reduce the size of the building shown by using only the central motive and leaving out some of the lettering. Mr. Woolley did not leave a duplicate of the designs which he passed around for inspection, as he had only the one set.

The Director further said that he had hoped to bring with him the final designs for the new subsidiary coins, but that Mr. Weinman and Mr. MacNeil, the two sculptors, had not been able to complete their models. He requested the Chairman to designate a committee to inspect these designs later on, and he was advised that this matter would be left in the hands of Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield, the same committee with whom he had conferred before.

A.B.C. MEDIATOR MEDALS: Miss Janet Scudder had written Mr. Phillips, Assistant Secretary of State, that she had restudied her design for the obverse of the A. B. C. mediator medals, and would send it to him for approval. Mr. Phillips, learning

of the proposed meeting in New York, requested Miss Scudder to turn the model over to the committee for an opinion. The design was turned over to Mr. Adams and Mr. Blashfield as a committee, who later recommended approval of the general composition and arrangement of the design with the understanding that there will be a resubmission of the executed model before the dies for the medal are struck. (See Exhibit A.)

HEIGHTS OF BUILDINGS REPORT: Colonel Harts mentioned the matter of the proposed report to the District Commissioners on the question of suitable height limitations for buildings within the District of Columbia. He submitted for consideration certain points which he felt might be included in the report as drafted by the committee, stating that it was his feeling that the report was too general in form and not sufficiently explicit as to desirable limitations. These were discussed, and Mr. Olmsted and Mr. Anderson, the committee in charge of the preparation of the draft, took them into consideration in a further study of the preliminary draft which they had prepared.

LANDSCAPE TREATMENT AROUND LINCOLN MEMORIAL: Mr. Anderson had brought along a number of progressive studies Mr. Clarence Howard had sent him, leading up to a conclusion based on these studies. It was decided to request Mr. Howard to develop this final sketch in such form as to be compared with another study on different lines which Mr. Henry Bacon, the architect of the memorial, had prepared. Mr. Bacon was present during the discussion, and stated that he had sent to Washington a small-sized model showing his conclusions as to a desirable treatment of the approaches and other surroundings of the memorial.

Colonel Harts later stated that Mr. Bacon had decided upon Jules Guerin as his choice for the painter to do the interior mural decorations of the Lincoln Memorial, and asked whether, in the opinion of the members, he would be the best man for this work. The Committee felt that the architect's choice would be a satisfactory one, and also that a sum of from $40,000 to $45,000, mentioned as available for the

203

work, would not be at all too large for work of that character.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC: Colonel Harts informed the members that the Secretary of War had written a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approving the old Casey-Burr design for a memorial bridge across the Potomac as suitable for the proposed new location between the Lincoln Memorial, as one terminus, and Arlington, as the other, and stating that he did not deem it necessary to expend any more money for additional designs in view of the fact that a satisfactory design already was selected. The members advised that the old design was prepared at a time when the Lincoln Memorial was still an undecided matter, and that, in view of its erection in West Potomac Park, the old design would have to be restudied if it was to be in any way adopted, - in particular that the large towers appearing on the bridge in the design would have to be eliminated so that there would be no competition with the treatment of the Lincoln Memorial terminus. They felt that the proposed bridge at the new location should be of the simplest possible design and should not detract by architectural embellishment from the treatment of either terminus; and that the treatment of the approaches to the bridge from the Arlington side, which had not yet been carefully studied, needed such study. Mr. Olmsted offered to write a personal note to the Secretary of War, and asked Colonel Harts also to tell the Secretary the Commission's views as discussed. This was done.

LIMITATION OF SIZE AND DESIGNS OF TOMBSTONES FOR ARLINGTON CEMETERY: Colonel Harts informed the members that the official authorities in charge of Arlington Cemetery had accepted all the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the treatment of Arlington Cemetery, but had asked for further advice and assistance in connection with the solving of the problem of proper limitation in size and designs of tombstones to be erected there in the future. He stated that this matter had been referred to Mr. Olmsted, who was the committee that had handled

the previous reference. The matter was discussed. Mr. Olmsted's report, which was later transmitted, was approved by the members of the Commission and copies have already been furnished separatively.

BOTANIC GARDEN: Colonel Harts also called the attention of the members to the following extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Senate Committee on the Library held February 22d last:

> "A Committee consisting of Senators Cummins, Newlands, and Gallinger was appointed to confer with Colonel Harts, and to enter into correspondence with the Commission of Fine Arts for the purpose of procuring from them a plan adapting the plan of the Park Commission to the Grant monument and to the retention of the hot houses where they now are; and also for the purpose of suggesting a site in Rock Creek Park for an arboretum and an enlarged Botanic Garden, and to consider whether all of Rock Creek Park should not be considered as a grand arboretum and botanic garden, beginning at some site to be selected by the Commission and gradually carrying out the original plan, as adopted, to its ultimate consummation.".

BILLS REFERRED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY:

A number of bills introduced in the present Congress and referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library were then taken up. The action in each case was as follows:

S.4682, to purchase an oil painting entitled "Our Glory-the Battleship Oregon". The Commission had previously reported on a similar bill for the purchase of this painting introduced in the preceding Congress, and requested Mr. Blashfield to paraphrase that report and add a sentence to the effect that the amount of $25,000 provided for in the bill for the acquisition of the painting might be considerably reduced. The report made is attached under Exhibit B.

S. 3345, for the purchase, for $20,000, of oil portraits of twenty-five former justices of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Blashfield was requested also to draft a reply in this matter, and for that purpose to paraphrase a previous report made on the same subject, adding a sentence to the effect that the amount requested was somewhat high. See Exhibit C for report made.

the previous reference. The matter was discussed. Mr. Olmsted's report, which was later presented, was approved by the Chairman of the Committee and copies have already been furnished separately.

SCENIC DRIVES: Colonel Hartz also called the attention of the members to the following extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Parks Committee on the Library held February 22d last:

> "A Committee consisting of Mayor Rolph, Chairman, Supervisors Tallant and Uhl, appointed to confer with Colonel Hartz, and to enter into correspondence with the Commission of Fine Arts for the purpose of procuring from them a plan adapting the plan of the Park Commission to the Grant monument and to the retention of the hot houses where they now are; and also for the purpose of suggesting a site in Rock Creek Park for an arboretum and an enlarged Botanic Garden, and to consider whether all of Rock Creek Park should not be considered as a grand arboretum and botanic garden, beginning at some site to be selected by the Committee and gradually carrying out the original plan, as adopted, to its ultimate consummation."

BILLS REMAINING BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY:

A number of bills introduced in the present Congress and referred for report by the Senate Committee on the Library were then taken up. The action in each case was as follows:

S.4668, to authorize an oil painting entitled "Don Diego--The Englishman of Oregon". The Commission had previously reported on a similar bill for the purchase of this painting introduced in the preceding Congress, but recommended that to paraphrase that report and add a sentence to the effect that the amount of $5,000 provided for in the bill for the acquisition of the painting might be considerably reduced. The report made is attached under Exhibit B.

S. 3345, for the purchase, for $20,000, of oil portraits of twenty-five former justices of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Olmsted was requested to draft a reply in this matter, and for that purpose to paraphrase a previous report made on the same subject, adding a sentence to the effect that the amount requested was somewhat high. See Exhibit C for report made.

S. 2263, S. 611, and S. 675, providing for the erection of monuments in Washington to the memory of General John Sullivan, Matthew Fontaine Maury, and John Ericsson, respectively. It was directed that these bills should be reported on along the lines of a report made in December, 1914, on similar bills providing for the erection of monuments to Sullivan and Maury in Washington. This was done, as is shown by Exhibit D.

S. 4269 proposed a suitable memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pa. The committee directed a report advising against the passage of the bill for the reason that, in their opinion, the sum of ten thousand dollars mention therein was inadequate for a suitable national monument to Lincoln, and that, as Congress is now spending a large sum of money for the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, it would appear unsuitable at this time to erect another monument to him in such close proximity to the Capital. See Exhibit E.

S. 3651 provided for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon in the courthouse square at Warrenton, N. C. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill in case Congress should decide to erect a monument to him, but they suggested inserting a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design, and that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial". See Exhibit F.

S. 610 provided for the erection of a statue to John Marshall in the hallway of the courtroom of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Federal building at Richmond, Va. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill, but suggested that the design of the statue and the completed statue itself shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to procure the best artistic results for the United States. See Exhibit G.

S. 613 provided for the erection of a monument in Abingdon, Va., to the memory of General William Campbell. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill,

S. 2265, S. 611, and S. 675, providing for the erection of monuments in Washington to the memory of General John Sullivan, Matthew Fontaine Maury, and John Witherspoon, respectively. It was directed that these bills should be reported on along the lines of a report made in December, 1914, on similar bills providing for the erection of monuments to Sullivan and Maury in Washington. This was done, as is shown by Exhibit D.

H. 4259 proposed a suitable memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pa. The committee directed a report adverse to the passage of the bill for the reason that, in their opinion, the sum of ten thousand dollars mentioned therein was inadequate for a suitable national monument to Lincoln, and that, as Congress is now spending a large sum of money for the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, it would appear undesirable at this time to erect another monument to him in such close proximity to the Capital. See Exhibit E.

S. 3651 provided for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon in the courthouse square at Warrenton, N. C. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill in case Congress should decide to erect a monument to him, but suggested inserting a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design, and that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial". See Exhibit F.

S. 610 provided for the erection of a statue to John Marshall in the hallway of the courtroom of the United States District Court of Appeals in the Federal building at Richmond, Va. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill, but suggested that the duties of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Municipal Art Council meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in order to promote the best artistic results for the United States. See Exhibit G.

S. 613 provided for the erection of a monument in Arlington, Va., to the memory of General William Campbell. The committee saw no objection to the form of the bill,

but suggested a provision to the effect that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the words "monument" and "statue" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial". See Exhibit H.

S. 194 provided for the erection of a memorial in the form of a shaft to Colonel Edward Dickinson Baker at Balls Bluff, Va. The committee felt that a suitable simple form of memorial could be obtained for the sum of $5,000 given in the bill, but felt it injudicious to prescribe the form of memorial by designating a shaft; they suggested that the word "memorial" should be substituted for the word "shaft" and that the decision as to what form the memorial should take should then be left to the Executive Officer in charge of the construction of the memorial. They further suggested the insertion of a provision to the effect that the design and the completed memorial itself shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. See Exhibit I.

S. 376 provided for the erection of a suitable memorial in the city of Knoxville, Tenn. to Admiral David Glasgow Farragut. The committee suggested the insertion of a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. See Exhibit J.

S 3589 set aside that part of the newly acquired lands between the Union Station and the Capitol lying north of C street for sites for memorial to women and their achievements. The committee questioned the expediency on artistic grounds of making such a determination in advance of any general plan for the development of the area referred to, and also felt that it would seem injudicious to restrict the type of memorial to be located there, should Congress so decide, to any particular class. Preparation of this report was turned over to Mr. Moore, See Exhibit K.

S. 2885 proposed giving the D. A. R. permission to erect statues or busts of former President and Vice-President of the United States in 16th street in this city. The committee felt that the size and length of 16th street is such that the statues or busts would seem lost. The advised against the bill on the ground

S. 2885 proposed giving the D. A. R. permission to erect statues or busts of former President and Vice-President of the United States in 16th street in this city. The committee felt that the size and length of 16th street is such that the statues or busts would seem lost. The advised against the bill on the

that the memorials, if placed in that location, would commemorate these men in far less ~~important~~ positions than other Presidents who had already been commemorated. Mr. Moore was also requested to draft this reply, which is given under Exhibit L.

S. 1359, authorized the Secretary of War to erect at Valparaiso, Chile, a suitable monument to the memory of the officer and sailors who were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the English ships Phoebe and Cherub in 1814. The committee felt that, however gratifying it might be to this country and to Chile to erect such a monument, it might create unpleasant feelings in our great neighbor England, and that monuments of that character which are so peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people should be erected within the borders of our own country, - otherwise other nations might also decide to erect monuments for similar purposes without considering these delicate points of propriety. The preparation of this report was left to Mr. Moore, but as several questions arose during his consideration of the reply which have not yet been cleared up, no report has been forwarded.

S. 452 provided for the erection of a suitable monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps in the Isthmian Canal Zone. The committee directed the secretary to paraphrase a previous report made regarding the same subject. See Exhibit M.

S. 609 proposed an appropriation of $5,000 to aid the Pocahontas Memorial Association in completing and erecting a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Virginia. The committee advised against the bill because they understood a suitable monument to Pocahontas already existed at Norfolk. It has since been ascertained that no monument to Pocahontas is located at either Norfolk or Jamestown, and that what was probably in the minds of the committee was the base for the statue for the acquisition of which the $5,000 provided in this bill was to be used. The report has been held until the next meeting.

S. 2394 proposes the purchase of a large painting of the battle of Gettysburg by James Walker for the sum of $150,000, such painting to be placed in the Lincoln

S. 1279, authorizing the temporary deposit of the Liberty, Chile, a suitable monument to the memory of the officer and sailors who were killed during the engagement between the United States ship Essex and the English ship Phoebe and Cherub in 1814. The committee felt that, however gratifying it might be to this country and to Chile to erect such a monument, it might create unpleasant feeling [illegible] are so peculiarly commemorative of the bravery of our own people should be erected within the borders of our own country, - otherwise other nations might also decide to erect monuments for similar purposes without considering these delicate points of propriety. The preparation of this report was left to Mr. Moore, but as several questions arose during his consideration of the subject there not yet been cleared up, no report has been forwarded.

S. 432 provided for the erection of a suitable monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps in the Isthmian Canal Zone. The committee directed the secretary to paraphrase a previous report made regarding the same subject. See Exhibit M.

S. 609 proposed an appropriation of $5,000 to aid the Pocahontas Memorial Association in duly [illegible] a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Virginia. The committee advised against the bill because they understood a suitable monument to Pocahontas already existed at Norfolk. It has since been ascertained that no monument to Pocahontas is located at either Norfolk or Jamestown, and that what may probably be the wishes of the committee was the basis for the statute for the acquisition of which the $5,000 provided in this bill was to be used. The report has been held until the next meeting.

H. 2324 proposes the purchase of a large painting of the battle of Bunker Hill by Trumbull for the sum of $100,000, such painting to be placed in the Lincoln

Memorial in Washington. This bill was referred to Mr. Blashfield for inspection of the painting and report.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING: Colonel Harts brought up for informal discussion the matter of the proposed archives building to be erected in Washington.

Mr. Moore said that he had seen the preliminary sketch design for this building, and that he believed it to be of a type suitable for location on the Mall or elsewhere on a good location in Washington. He added that he had been assured that it would be referred to the Commission at the proper time.

Colonel Harts called attention to a report Professor Jameson of the Carnegie Institute at Washington had prepared, it was understood as the suggestion of the building commission in charge of this building, in which he discussed the suitability of various sites, which he had lettered on an accompanying chart from A to H. The Committee felt that site A, immediately north of the Congressional Library, would probably be the most suitable but that they were opposed to closing Maryland avenue. As the design for the proposed building will probably not fit into that area unless Maryland Avenue is closed in the same manner as Pennsylvania Avenue was closed to accommodate the Congressional Library, site A probably could not be considered. Of the other sites suggested by Professor Jameson, site lettered D appealed to them as next best; this is the area immediately east of the site already set aside for the George Washington Memorial Hall, and is located immediately between Pennsylvania Avenue and The Mall. This was only the members' informal opinion, since the matter had not come before them officially and they were without any official information on the subject.

The Committee, after some further discussion, then adjourned.

Memorial in Washington. This bill was referred to Mr. Blanchfield for inspection
and to bring back reports.

NATIONAL ARMORIES BUILDING: Colonel Harts brought up for informal discussion the
matter of the proposed archives building to be erected in Washington.

Mr. Moore said that would have the preliminary sketch for this building,
and that he believed it to be of a type suitable for location on the Mall or elsewhere on a good location in Washington. He added that he had been assured that it would be referred to the Commission at the proper time.

Colonel Harts called attention to a report Professor Jameson of the Carnegie Institute at Washington had prepared, it was understood as the suggestion of the building commission in charge of this building, in which he discussed the suitability of various sites, which he had lettered on an accompanying chart from A to H. The committee felt that site A, immediately south of the Constitutional Gardens, would probably be the most suitable but that they were opposed to closing Maryland Avenue. As the design for the proposed building will probably not fit into that area unless Maryland Avenue is closed, site A probably could not be considered. Of the other sites suggested by Professor Jameson, site lettered H appealed to them as next best; this is the area immediately east of the site already set aside for the George Washington Memorial Hall, and is located immediately between Pennsylvania Avenue and The Mall. This was only the members' informal opinion, since the matter had not come before them officially and they were without any official information on the subject.

The Committee, after some further discussion, adjourned.

April 5, 1916.

My dear Mr. Phillips:

In accordance with your request, a committee of the Commission inspected Miss Scudder's photographs of her latest study ~~for~~ design for the obverse of the proposed A. B. C. mediator medals, and recommend your approval of the general composition and arrangement of the design presented; this approval to be given on the understanding that there will be a resubmission of the executed model before the dies for striking the medals are made.

By direction of the Commission:

Most sincerely, yours,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. William Phillips,

The Department of State.

ABC

709

April 3, 1919.

My dear Mr. Phillips:

In accordance with your request, a committee of the Commission inspected Miss Goodhue's photographs of her latest study [illegible] for the obverse of the proposed A. E. F. medallion medal, and recommend your approval of the general composition and arrangement of the design presented; this approval to be given on the understanding that there will be a resubmission of the executed model before the dies for striking the medals are made.

By direction of the Commission:

Most sincerely, yours,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Hon. William Phillips,

The Department of State.

ASC

April 5, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to S. 4682, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "To purchase an oil painting entitled "Our Glory - the battleship Oregon", by William F. Halsall, which has been submitted for report by your committee.

After an inspection of the painting the Commission report that, in their opinion, the historical value of this subject is very great; that the artistic value of the picture, although less great, is sufficient in combination with the said historic importance to justify its purchase by the Government at a price to be determined, not in excess of the amount proposed to be appropriated in the Bill.

The Commission of Fine Arts would note that the prices of pictures are governed not only by the intrinsic quality of the said pictures, but also by outside conditions, of sentiment, historic importance, scarcity of production, etc., so that it becomes almost impossible arbitrarily to determine what should or should not be paid for a picture. The Commission of Fine Arts , with all these facts in their minds, would remark that while less important pictures than "Our Glory-the battleship Oregon" have commanded greater prices than the one demanded, many more important pictures have been bought for much less than the said price. On the whole the Commission find twenty-five thousand dollars to be a price which might be considerably reduced without injustice being done.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee

on the Library, United States Senate.

B

April 5, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to S. 4662, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "To purchase an oil painting entitled "Our Glory - the battleship Oregon", by William F. Halsall, which has been submitted for report by your committee.

After an inspection of the painting the Commission report that, in their opinion, the historical value of this subject is very great; that the artistic value of the picture, although less great, is sufficient in combination with the said historic importance to justify the purchase by the Government at a price to be determined, but in excess of the amount proposed to be appropriated in the Bill.

The Commission of Fine Arts would note that the prices of pictures are governed not only by the intrinsic quality of the said pictures, but also by outside conditions, of sentiment, historic importance, scarcity of production, etc., so that it becomes almost impossible practically to determine what should or should not be paid for a picture. The Commission of Fine Arts, with all these facts in their minds, would remark that while less important pictures than "Our Glory-the battleship Oregon" have commanded greater prices than the one demanded, many more important pictures have been bought for much less than the said price. On the whole the Commission find twenty-five thousand dollars to be a price which might be considerably reduced without injustice being done.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee

on the Library, United States Senate.

April 8, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.3345, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the purchase of oil portraits of Justices of the United States Supreme Court Blair, Wilson, Iredell, Thomas Johnson, Chase, Patterson (stated as Pattison), Thompson, Wayne, Washington, Moore, William Johnson, Todd, Duval, Livingston, Trimble, Baldwin, Barbour, McKinley, McLean, Cushing, Peckham, Brown, Harlan, Brewer, and Moody (twenty-five in all), which were painted by Mr. Albert Rosenthal.

The Commission have already had the opportunity during the past year to report to the Senate Committee on the Library upon the merits of a bill providing for the acquisition of these portrait paintings for the sum of $20,000. The Commission advised that, if the historic importance of the portraits is considered by Congress to be sufficient, the artistic quality is good enough to justify the purchase of the portraits of justices Blair, Wilson, Iredell, ~~Thomas~~ Thomas Johnson, Chase, Patterson, Thompson, Wayne, Washington, Moore, William Johnson, Todd, Duval, Livingston, Trimble, Baldwin, Barbour, McKinley, McLean, and Cushing.

The Commission also recommended acceptance on the same basis of the five remaining portraits, namely those of justices Peckham, Brown, Harlan, Brewer and Moody, provided Congress desires to acquire them as historic documents. In case of their acceptance the Commission advised that the artist be instructed to reduce these five portraits to the dimensions in each case of the dimensions given to each of the twenty canvasses. This reduction was suggested, first, for the sake of historic significance in order that no factitious distinction may appear to be made by the sizes of the canvasses, and, secondly, because in case these canvasses should ever be paneled into walls, parity of size would be convenient to the process of paneling. The price asked for the group of portraits would seem to the Commission of Fine Arts to be somewhat high.

At the same time the Commission took the opportunity to suggest to your committee the advisability of gradually creating a permanent and complete collection of such portraits, and that, in order to ensure adequacy in their painting, as well as of other portraits to be owned by the Government, some regular procedure be approximately followed. In order to establish such a procedure it was suggested that several portrait painters of national reputation should be invited to furnish a list of artists who in their opinion would be able and willing to paint for a reasonable sum in each case adequate portraits from available data, and that such a list should at all times be available to the committee in charge of the question of such portrait painting.

The portraits so purchased should be preserved as historical documents of national import, and should not necessarily occupy any specific position; but when a specific position should be definitely allotted to them, it should be determined by experts and with a view to their availability for being paneled into the walls more or less symmetrically and in a way that should enhance the general decorative character of the said walls as well as with a view to their historic importance.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

April 8, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.3243, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the purchase of oil portraits of Justices of the United States Supreme Court Blair, Wilson, Iredell, Thomas Johnson, Chase, Patterson (stated as Justices), Thompson, Todd, Duval, Livingston, Brown, Harlan, Brewer, and Moody (twenty-five in all), which were painted by Mr. Albert Rosenthal.

The Commission have already had the opportunity earlier than last year to report to the Senate Committee on the Library upon the merits of a bill providing for the acquisition of these portraits for the sum of $25,000. The Commission advised that, if the historic importance of the portraits is maintained by Congress to be sufficient, the artistic quality is good enough to justify the purchase of the portraits of Justices Blair, Wilson, Iredell, Thomas Johnson, Chase, Patterson, Thompson, Wayne, Washington, Moore, William Johnson, Todd, Duval, Livingston, Trimble, Baldwin, Barbour, McKinley, Nelson, and Canning.

The Commission also recommended acceptance on the same basis of the five remaining portraits, namely those of Justices Jackson, Grier, Nelson, Strong and Moody, provided Congress desires to acquire them as pictures in themselves. In case of their acceptance the Commission advises that the artist be instructed to reduce these five portraits to the dimensions in one case of the dimensions given to each of the twenty canvasses. This reduction was suggested, first, for the sake of historic significance in order that no fictitious distinction may appear to be made by the sizes of the canvasses, and, secondly, because in case these canvasses should ever be packed into walls, parts of also would be overweight to the purposes of hanging. The price asked for the group of portraits would seem to the Commission of Fine Arts to be somewhat high.

At the same time the Commission took the opportunity to suggest to your committee the advisability of gradually [illegible] and complete collection of such portraits, and that, in order to ensure adequacy in their painting, as well as of other portraits to be owned by the Government, some regular procedure be approximately followed. In order to establish such a procedure it was suggested that several portrait painters of national reputation should be invited to furnish a list of artists who in their opinion would be able and willing to paint for a reasonable sum in each case adequate portraits [illegible] available date, and that such a list should at all times be available to the committee in charge of the question of such portrait painting.

The portraits so produced should be preserved as historical documents of national import, and should not necessarily convey any specific position; but when a specific position should be definitely affirmed in them, it should be determined by experts and with a view to their Availability [illegible] while [illegible] more or less symbolically one in a way that should subserve the general decorative character of the said walls as well as with a view to their historic importance.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

April 8, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have the honor to render their report on the following bills referred to them by your committee, which propose the erection of certain monuments in the city of Washington, D. C.

S. 2236, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a statue to the memory of General John Sullivan;
S. 611, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury; and
S. 675, 64th Congress, 1st Session, for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson.

On December 2, 1914, the Commission reported to your committee on bills providing for the erection in Washington of monuments to Sullivan and Maury, as follows:

"The Commission find themselves under certain embarrassment in formulating reports on these bills and others of similar import. The question which they present is as to the expediency of the Government commemorating the persons or the events indicated, and the Commission hesitate to express an opinion on historical subjects. Strictly speaking the function of the Commission is limited to passing upon the merits of works of art at some stage or stages of their execution, or to suggesting the methods of procuring suitable and worthy works of art, or to giving advice as to locations and the landscape settings appropriate to such works. The Commission conceive that their advice in regard to memorials begins when Congress has determined that the person or the event shall be commemorated by a work of art.

"At the same time the Commission realize keenly the desirability of a comprehensive, systematic plan by which the Government shall commemorate those persons and those events which have become an integral part of our history. Such action is the expression of feelings which do honor to the Nation, and thereby lessons of patrictism are taught to future generations. Moreover, in the development of The Mall, of Potomac Park, and of the newer portions of the city of Washington there is opportunity to place to advantage works of commemorative art. The first question is the selection of the persons and the events to be so commemorated.

" A haphazard selection, based on the enthusiasms of the hour, and also the practice of leaving the choice to associations or societies of a patriotic character, most often result in a distortion of historic perspective. The Government itself has gained rather than lost by seeming delays in taking action to commemorate its heroes. The Washington Monument was not undertaken by Congress until about 1878, after private initiative had failed; the Lincoln and the Grant Memorials are now in process of erection. Meantime, the majority of available sites for works of art in the central portion of the city of Washington have long been occupied by the statues of men subordinate to Gen. Grant in the war for the preservation of the Union.

"The motives which actuated the associations which contributed the statues of the generals are most praiseworthy, but as time goes on the lack of historic balance will become more and more apparent unless Congress shall take upon itself to devise and carry out some well-considered plan for the selection of the subject to be commemorated. As it is only two Presidents, no one of the great financiers, and only one statesman and one jurist find places among the Washington statues intended as ornaments to the city; yet numbers of the conspicuous locations in the city are occupied by the statues of persons who have played either no part or but a subordinate one in the development of the Nation. The very fact that it is now comparatively easy to raise an amount of money sufficient to procure a statue to occupy a prominent location for all time tends to overload the avenues and parks

April 8, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts has the honor to render their report on the following bills referred to them by your committee, which propose the erection of certain monuments in the city of Washington, D. C.:

S. 3268, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a statue to the memory of General John Sullivan;

S. 611, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury; and

S. 675, 64th Congress, 1st Session, for erecting a suitable memorial to John Ericsson.

On December 6, 1915, the Commission reported to your committee on bills providing for the erection in Washington of monuments to Gaitano and Maury, as follows:

"The Commission find themselves under certain embarrassment in formulating reports on these bills and others of similar import. The question is how they present is as to the expediency of the Government commemorating the persons or the events mentioned, and the Commission hesitate to express an opinion on historical subjects. Strictly speaking the function of the Commission is limited to passing upon the merits of works of art at some stage or stages of their execution, or to suggesting the methods of procuring suitable and worthy works of art, or to giving advice as to locations and the fitness artistic appropriateness to such works. The Commission conceive that their duties in regard to memorials begins when Congress has determined that the person or the event shall be commemorated by a work of art.

"At the same time the Commission realize keenly the desirability of a comprehensive, systematic plan by which the Government shall commemorate their leaders and those events which have become an integral part of our history. Such action is the expression of feelings which do honor to the Nation, and thereby lessons of patriotism are taught to future generations. Moreover, in the development of The Mall, or Potomac Park, and of the newer parts of the city of Washington there is opportunity to place to advantage works of monumental art. The first question is the selection of the persons and the events to be so commemorated.

"A deplorable selection, based on the assumptions or accidents of a politic character, must often result in a distortion of history. The Government itself has gained rather than lost by seeming delays in taking action to commemorate its heroes. The Washington Monument was not undertaken by Congress until about 1875, after private initiative had failed; the Lincoln and the Grant Memorials are now in process of erection. Meantime, the popularity of available sites for works of art in the central portion of the city of Washington have long been occupied by the statues of men subordinate to Gen. Grant in the war for the preservation of the Union.

"The motives which actuated the associations which commended the statues of the generals are most praiseworthy, but as time goes on the lack of historical balance will become more and more apparent unless Congress shall take some well-considered plan for the selection of the events and persons to be commemorated. As it is only two Presidents, no one of the great statesmen, and only one statesman and one jurist find places among the statues which are interested as ornaments to the city; yet members of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government, the very fact that it is more city are occupied by the statues of persons who have played either no part or only to occupy a prominent location for all time tends to overload the avenue and park

with that form of art least likely to give lasting pleasure.

"These considerations lead the Commission of Fine Arts to suggest to the Committee on the Library that the whole subject of the adornment of Washington by commemorative works of art be referred to a body to be created for that purpose by Congress, and that one or more historians of recognized standing be appointed to act with representatives of the Government in formulating a plan of procedure. With such a body the Commission of Fine Arts would be pleased to act in so far as their advice on matters of art might be required.

"The Commission desire to say further that all memorials designed to be located in Washington should be, first of all, works of art. Portrait statues as portraits are not desirable objects of ornament for parks or thoroughfares. It often happens that a given site would best be occupied by a fountain, by a reproduction of a work of art that has been famous through the centuries as has been done in other countries, by the representation of some object in nature, or in any one of the many ways in which the artist finds expression for his ideas. If the city of Washington is to have an adornment worthy of its great plan, its spacious parks, and its noble buildings, the time has come to formulate a systematic and comprehensive method of making selections and expending such appropriations as Congress may see fit to make for the purchase of works of art."

These suggestions are applicable also in the case of the bill proposing the memorial to John Ericsson.

The Commission also beg to suggest that the word "Memorial" be substituted for the words "monument" and "statue" wherever they appear in the bills, the former word permitting of artistic treatment of the subject along broader lines; and that the site and design be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

304

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

April 10, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to S. 4269, 64th Congress, 1st Session, referred to them for report.

The Commission feel that, as Congress is now spending a large sum for a suitable national memorial to Abraham Lincoln in Washington, D. C., it would be unsuitable at this time to erect another monument to him so near to the Capital City. Furthermore, the sum mentioned in the Bill, in the opinion of the Commission, is inadequate for a national monument to Lincoln. For these reasons the Commission advise against the passage of the Bill.

By direction of the Commission.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,

Committee on the Library,

United States Senate.

April 30, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to S. 4258, 64th Congress, 1st Session, referred to them for report.

The Commission feel that, as Congress is now spending a large sum for a suitable national memorial to Abraham Lincoln in Washington, D. C., it would be undesirable at this to direct monetary [illegible] to him so near to the Capital City. Furthermore, the sum mentioned in the bill, in the opinion of the Commission, is inadequate for a national monument to Lincoln. For these reasons the Commission advise against the passage of the bill.

By direction of the Commission.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,

Committee on the Library,

United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.3651, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "For the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon", in the courthouse square at Warrenton, North Carolina.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to Nathaniel Macon, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

The Commission further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the Bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along larger and broader lines.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,

Committee on the Library,

United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 19, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.3651, 64th Congress, 1st Session, "for the erection of a monument to Nathaniel Macon", in the courthouse square at Warrenton, North Carolina.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, while they deem it desirable to erect a monument to Nathaniel Macon, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would prevent the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

The Commission further suggest that the word "monument" appearing in the bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along larger and broader lines.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,

Committee on the Library,

United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 610, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a statue to John Marshall in the Hallway of the court room of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Federal Building at Richmond, Virginia.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress desire to provide this statue, from the artistic side they see no objection to the form of the bill. They would suggest, however, that a provision be inserted to the effect that the design for the statue and the completed statue shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design and the acceptance of an unsatisfactory statue.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 24, 1918.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledges the reference, for report, of S. 610, 65th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a statue to John Marshall in the Hallway of the court room of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Federal Building at Richmond, Virginia.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress desire to provide this statue, from the artistic side they see no objection to the form of the bill. They would suggest, however, that a provision be inserted to the effect that the design for the statue and the completed statue shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design and the acceptance of an unsatisfactory statue.

Respectfully,

Wm. V. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 613, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a monument in Abingdon, Virginia, to the memory of General William Campbell.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to General Campbell, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

The Commission further suggest that the words "monument" and "statue" appearing in the Bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
The Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 812, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a monument in Arlington, Virginia, to the memory of General William Campbell.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect a monument to General Campbell, from the artistic side it would seem advisable to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Such a provision would prevent the selection of an unsuitable design.

The Commission further suggest that the words "Monument" and "statue" appearing in the Bill be changed to "memorial", the latter term permitting of treatment along broader lines.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
The Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledges the reference, for report, of S. 194, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a memorial, in the form of a shaft, to Colonel Edward Dickinson Baker at Balls Bluff, Virginia.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress see fit to provide for a monument to Colonel Baker, a suitable simple form of memorial can be obtained for the amount mentioned in the bill. The Commission, however, feel that it is injudicious to prescribe the design of the monument in the bill by designating a shaft, and suggest that "memorial" be substituted for "shaft" and the decision as to the form then be left to the Executive Officer in charge of the construction of the monument, if authorized.

The Commission also suggest that a provision be inserted to the effect that the design for the memorial and the completed memorial shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts ; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design and the acceptance of an unsatisfactorily executed monument.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel,U.S.Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 10, 1914.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S. 196, 66th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a memorial, in the form of a shaft, in National Memorial Cemetery at Bells Bluff, Virginia.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress decide to provide for a monument to Colonel Baker, a suitable simple form of memorial can be selected for the amount mentioned in the bill. The Commission, however, feel that it is inadvisable to prescribe the design of the monument in the bill by designating a shaft, and request that "memorial" be substituted for "shaft" and the Secretary entrusted as to the form then be left to the Executive Officer in charge of the construction of the monument, if erected.

The Commission also suggest that a provision be inserted to the effect that the design for the memorial and the completed memorial shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts ; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design and the acceptance of an unsatisfactorily executed monument.

Respectfully,

Wm. S. Sharp
Colonel,U.S.Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 13, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.376, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a suitable memorial in the city of Knoxville, Tennessee, to Admiral David Glasgow Farragut.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect such a memorial to Admiral Farragut, it would seem advisable from the artistic point of view to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Harts
Colonel, U.S.Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Senate Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

April 15, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the reference, for report, of S.376, 64th Congress, 1st Session, providing for the erection of a suitable memorial in the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Admiral David Dixon Porter.

The Commission direct me to inform you that, should Congress deem it desirable to erect such a memorial to Admiral Porter, it would seem advisable from the artistic point of view to insert a provision that the design shall meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; such a provision would protect the United States from the selection of an unsuitable design.

Respectfully,

The Chairman,
Senate Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.,

May 22, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, to whom was referred the Bill S. 2589, 64th Congress, 1st Session, setting aside certain lands in the District of Columbia as a site for memorials to woman, respectfully report:

In the opinion of the Commission it is inadvisable to set apart any area for a class of statues or other memorials, in advance of actual provision for such memorials, specifying the person or thing to be commemorated and the general character of the memorial.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

ABC

Washington, D. C.,

May 22, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, to whom was referred bill S. 2885, 64th Congress, 1st Session, permitting the erection of statues in Sixteenth Street, sometimes called The Avenue of the Presidents, respectfully report:

Congress has already provided memorials of great distinction for Presidents Washington and Lincoln. There are also statues of Washington, Lincoln, Grant and Garfield. In the opinion of the Commission it is inadvisable to set apart any area for a class of statues or other memorials in advance of actual provision for such memorials specifying the person or thing to be commemorated and the general character of the memorial.

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully,

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

April 8, 1916.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts has carefully considered S. 452, 64th Congress, 1st Session, a bill to erect a monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps in the Isthmian Canal Zone, referred for report by your committee.

The Commission had the honor on January 27, 1915, to make report to your committee on a similar bill providing for a monument to De Lesseps in the Canal Zone. Their report was as follows:

"From the artistic point of view the appropriateness of some monumental recognition of De Lesseps in connection with the Panama Canal is obvious, and if Congress is willing to appropriate the funds there is nothing objectionable in the form of the bill. The Commission urges, however, that it would be more impressive and finer as a matter of art and more true to historic perspective if De Lesseps were to be commemorated at Panama, not as an isolated individual, but as one of that series of distinguished men to whose united and cumulative effort the creation of the canal is due."

"To erect at Panama a monument exclusively to De Lesseps and either to leave all the others who contributed to the building of the canal unrecognized or to give to each in turn a similar isolated, independent monument, would be to waste a wonderfully artistic opportunity and run a risk of marring the impressive simplicity of the canal by a host of impertinent and competing memorial structures."

"One of the most significant, impressive, and inspiring things about the canal has been the splendid cooperation of a great number of people in a strongly unified organization, the self-subordination of individuals to the highest success of the enterprise as a whole. For this reason, if for no other, it would seem finer, more significant, and immensely more impressive that anything commemorating an individual in his relation to the Panama Canal should represent him as one of the great group of men whose several efforts and abilities have been able by combination, and only by combination, to accomplish so great a success. This dominant idea would be expressed by incorporating all such individual memorials in a great central memorial to the makers of the canal. The Commission of Fine Arts, in its report on the canal, suggested that such a central memorial might be created at the Culebra Cut (S.Doc.146; 63d, 1st, pp.14-15), although the question of its location and design does not affect the general principle. A peculiarly happy method of emphasizing the relation of De Lesseps to the great undertaking in connection with such a memorial at the Culebra Cut would be to mark in a conspicuous and monumental manner the spot high up, upon the hillside above the point of deepest cut, where the French, under De Lesseps, began the great excavation.".

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Chairman,
The Committee on the Library,
United States Senate.

313

April 8, 1916.

The Commission of Fine Arts has carefully considered S. 452, 64th Congress, 1st Session, a bill to erect a monument to Ferdinand de Lesseps in the Isthmian Canal Zone, referred for report by your committee.

The Commission had the honor on January 27, 1915, to make report to your committee on a similar bill providing for a monument to De Lesseps in the Canal Zone. Their report was as follows:

"From the artistic point of view the appropriateness of some monumental recognition of De Lesseps in connection with the Panama Canal is obvious, and Congress is willing to appropriate the funds there is nothing objectionable in the form of the bill. The Commission urges, however, that it would be more impressive and finer as a matter of art and more true to historic perspective if De Lesseps were to be commemorated at Panama, not as an isolated individual, but as one of that series of distinguished men to whose united and cumulative effort the creation of the canal is due."

"To erect at Panama a monument exclusively to De Lesseps and either to leave the others who contributed to the building of the canal unrecognized or to add to each in turn a similar isolated, independent monument, would be to waste wonderfully artistic opportunity and run a risk of marring the impressive unity of the canal by a host of impertinent and competing memorial structures."

"One of the most significant, impressive, and inspiring things about the canal has been the splendid cooperation of a great number of people in a strongly unified organization, the self-subordination of individuals to the highest accomplishment of the enterprise as a whole. For this reason, if for no other, it would be finer, more significant, and immensely more impressive that anything commemorating an individual in his relation to the Panama Canal should represent him as one of the great group of men whose several efforts and abilities have been able by combination, and only by combination, to accomplish so great a success. This great central memorial to the makers of the canal. The Commission of Fine Arts in its report on the canal, suggested that such a central memorial might be located at the Culebra Cut (S.Doc.146; 63d, 1st, pp.14-15), although the question of location and design does not affect the general principle. A peculiarly appropriate method of emphasizing the relation of De Lesseps to the great undertaking would be in connection with such a memorial at the Culebra Cut would be to mark in a picturesque and monumental manner the spot high up, upon the hillside above the point of deepest cut, where the French, under De Lesseps, began the great excavation."

By direction of the Commission:

Respectfully

WM. W. HARTS.

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary and Executive Officer.

Chairman.

The Committee on the Library,

United States Senate.